

REMARKS

Claims 2, 3, 7, and 8 have been canceled. Claims 4 and 5, and amended claims 1 and 6 are in the present application.

Claims 1 and 4-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Igarashi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,940,143).

Amended independent claim 1 recites in part the following:

"receiving means for tuning and demodulating a reception signal of a frequency bandwidth with an interference signal having a carrier frequency of a highest peak level mixed in said frequency bandwidth;

phase locking means for attaining phase locking to said interference signal of said highest peak level;" (emphasis added)

In explaining the above 102 rejection with regard to claim 1, the Examiner asserted that PLL 130 and lines 18-35 of column 5, lines 7-15 and 31-42 of column 6, lines 1-52 of column 7, lines 30-40 of column 8, lines 48-65 of column 9, and lines 35+ of column 11 of Igarashi disclose the phase locking means of claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that such portions of Igarashi do not specifically disclose the phase locking means of claim 1 for at least the reasons described below.

The phase locking means of claim 1 may attain "phase locking to said interference signal of said highest peak level." On the other hand, PLL 130 (along with controller 220) of Igarashi appears to control first oscillator 120 so that "oscillation is performed at a frequency corresponding to a desired channel." (emphasis added) (See lines 8-9 of column 6 of Igarashi.) Further, as stated in one of the portions of

Igarashi relied on by the Examiner (i.e., lines 11-15 of column 6), Igarashi states that the PLL 130

"compares a signal obtained by dividing an oscillation frequency having a stable frequency from the reference oscillator 140 with a signal obtained by dividing an oscillation frequency from the first local oscillator 120 to control the oscillation frequency of the first local oscillator so that the error becomes zero."

Thus, the portions of Igarashi relied on by the Examiner do not appear to disclose that the PLL 130 is used for locking to an interference signal of "said highest peak level."

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is distinguishable from Igarashi as applied by the Examiner.

For reasons similar to those previously described with regard to independent claim 1, it is also respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 5 is also distinguishable from Igarashi as applied by the Examiner.

Claims 4 and 6 are dependent from one of independent claims 1 and 5. Accordingly, it is also respectfully submitted that dependent claims 4 and 6 are also distinguishable from Igarashi as applied by the Examiner for at least the reasons previously described with regard to claims 1 and 5.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been overcome, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections and/or rejections which the Examiner might have.

Application No.: 09/862,826

Docket No.: SONYJP 3.0-783

If there are any charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: January 22, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Dennis M. Smid, Esq.

Registration No.: 34,930

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant

728164_1.DOC